



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

such an act is within the power of Congress. We shall thus be able to avoid the danger pointed out by Mr. Chief Justice Taft in his opinion in the *Bailey* case, when he says, "Grant the validity of the law, and all that Congress would have to do hereafter in seeking to take over to its control any one of the great number of subjects of public interest, jurisdiction over which is reserved to the states by the Tenth Amendment to the federal Constitution, would be to enact a detailed measure of complete regulation of the subject and enforce it by a so-called 'tax' upon departures from it. To give such magic to the word tax would be to break down all constitutional limitations of the powers of Congress and completely wipe out the sovereignty of the states."

W. E. B.

SUPREME COURT REPORTS.—The REVIEW has been asked by the Court Reporter to publish the following statement:

"Last July Congress passed an act (Public Act No. 272) providing for the publication of the Official Reports of the Supreme Court in the government printing office and for their sale to the public at cost of production, including a part of the appropriation made for the maintenance of the Reporter's office. This did away with the method of publication through contracts between the Reporter and private publishing houses, which had obtained from the beginning. The last contract of that kind expired with the publication of Volume 256, which completed the reports for the October, 1920, term. The letting of a new contract to cover the opinions of the 1921 term was impracticable, owing to the pendency of the legislation, to the expectation that it would be enacted long before it actually was, and to definite indications that, when enacted, it would supersede the contract method.

"For various reasons incident to the ending of the old contract and the legislative change, editorial work on the opinions of the 1921 term was seriously delayed. Time also was consumed by administration preliminaries under the new law and in making necessary preparations in the printing office. Notwithstanding this, however, gratifying progress has been made. The reports of these opinions will be contained in three volumes, to be numbered 257, 258 and 259, all of which, it is confidently expected, will be published in bound and pamphlet form before the close of the year."

THE RAILWAY STRIKE INJUNCTION.—The bill in this case was filed by the United States of America against various labor organizations, and officers of such organizations, concerned in the strike of railway shopmen. It alleged (in brief) a conspiracy on the part of defendants to compel the railroads to disregard the wage decision of the Labor Board, by obstructing the transportation of passengers and property in interstate commerce and the carriage of the mails. A temporary restraining order was issued on September 1, and a temporary injunction on September 25. None of the defendants answered the bill, but two of them appeared, moving to dismiss the bill and